

PARSONS — U.S. Appl. No. 10/812,083  
Attorney Docket No.: 071469-0306000

- Amendment After Final Rejection -

REMARKS

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 06 2006

Reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims, in view of the following remarks, are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action dated June 7, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5 and 9-12, under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as allegedly being anticipated by Yamashita '769 (U.S. Patent No. 5,389,769); and rejected claims 6-8, under U.S.C. §103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over Yamashita '769.

The Examiner also objected to the Specification as lacking headers.

By this Amendment, claims 2 and 5-10 have been amended to provide a clearer presentation of the claimed subject matter. Applicant submits that no new matter has been introduced. Claims 1-12 are currently submitted for examination, of which claims 2 and 6-10 are independent.

With regard to the objections to the headers, Applicant strenuously disagree with the Examiner's assertions that the headers and associated sections are required. However, in an effort to expedite the successful examination of this application, Applicant has drafted appropriate sections, as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, the immediate withdrawal of the objections to the Specification is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully traverses the prior art rejections, under 35 U.S.C. §§102(b), 103(a), for the following reasons:

1. Prior Art Rejections Under §§102(b), 103(a).

As indicated above, amended independent claim 2 now positively recites, *inter alia*, attaching the identification tag to the part or sub assembly of the semiconductor processing tool, the identification tag comprising a passive resonant circuit that is responsive to radio frequency energy. Claim 2 also positively recites applying a radio frequency signal to the identification tag, which creates a measurable decrease in field strength in at least a portion of the radio frequency signal, and determining the presence or absence of the decreased field

PARSONS -- U.S. Appl. No. 10/812,083  
Attorney Docket No.: 071469-0306000

- Amendment After Final Rejection -

strength. These features are amply supported by the embodiments disclosed in the written description. (See, Original Specification: par. [00024]-[00026]).

In contrast to the Examiner's assertions, the Yamashita '769 reference is incapable of teaching or suggesting each and every element of independent claim 2, including the features identified above. In particular, Yamashita '769 discloses the use of card-shaped IC modules 30A, 30B, which are buried in predetermined regions of the surfaces of the container 10 and the wafer cassette 15, respectively. Yamashita '769 further discloses that each of the IC modules 30A, 30B include a signal transmitting and receiving antenna (or loop antenna) 31, a demodulation circuit 32, a control circuit 33, a reloadable memory (such as an EEPROM) 34, a modulation circuit 35, and a regulator 36. (See, Yamashita '769: col. 3, line 65 - col. 4, line 22; FIGs. 1B, 2).

With this configuration, Yamashita '769 specifically discloses that when it is determined that the calling signal is for the IC module 30A, the module 30A *transmits a response signal*  $K_{01}$  to a fixed station 30 through the module's antenna 31. (See, Yamashita '769: col. 4, lines 44-47; FIG. 2).

In so doing, Yamashita '769 does not, in any way, teach or suggest that the identification tag comprises a *passive resonant circuit* that is responsive to radio frequency energy, as required by claim 2. If anything, Yamashita '769 specifically teaches that the IC modules 30A, 30B employ an active circuit capable of generating and transmitting a response signal, which effectively teaches away from the recitations of the claim.

Along these lines, Yamashita '769 further fails to teach or suggest applying a radio frequency signal to the identification tag, which creates a measurable decrease in field strength in at least a portion of the radio frequency signal, and determining the presence or absence of the decreased field strength, as also required by claim 2. That is, Yamashita '769 only discloses a detection scheme where the IC modules 30A, 30B are identified by generating and transmitting a response signal, as noted above. As such, there is nothing in Yamashita '769 that remotely suggests detecting by virtue of detecting decreased field strength.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that Yamashita '769 clearly fails to teach each and every element of claim 1. Accordingly, independent claim 2 is patentable and the immediate withdrawal of the prior art rejection of claim 2 is respectfully requested. In

PARSONS -- U.S. Appl. No. 10/812,083  
Attorney Docket No.: 071469-0306000

- Amendment After Final Rejection -

addition, because claims 1 and 3-5 depend from claim 2, claims 1 and 3-5 are patentable at least by virtue of dependency as well as for their additional recitations and the immediate withdrawal of the prior art rejections of claims 1 and 3-5 is also requested.

Moreover, because independent claims 6-10 recite features that are similar to the patentable features of claim 2, claims 6-10 are patentable at least for the reasons given regarding claim 2. And, because claims 11-12 depend from claim 10, claims 11-12 are patentable at least by virtue of dependency as well as for their additional recitations. Accordingly, the immediate withdrawal of the prior art rejections of claims 6-12 is also requested.

## II. Conclusion.

All matters having been addressed and in view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the immediate allowance of all pending claims.

Applicant submit that the entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 as the claim changes: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not require any further consideration as the changes incorporate, in one form or another, features that should have been already searched; and (c) places the application in better form for an Appeal, should an Appeal be necessary.

Applicant's Counsel remains ready to assist the Examiner in any way to facilitate and expedite the prosecution of this matter. If any point remains in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, please contact the Undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

**PARSONS** — U.S. Appl. No. **10/812,083**  
Attorney Docket No.: 071469-0306000

- Amendment After Final Rejection -

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number **03-3975**. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**PILLSBURY WINTHROP  
SHAW PITTMAN LLP**



**E. RICO HERNANDEZ**  
Reg. No. **47,641**  
Tel. No. (703) 770-7788  
Fax No. (703) 770-7901  
Customer No. **00909**

Date: September 6, 2006.  
ERH  
P.O. Box 10500  
McLean, VA 22102  
(703) 770-7900